



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.								
10/099,931	03/14/2002	Oliver Bremer	944-004.002/NC 16334 US	2705								
4955 7590 10/11/2007 WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & ADOLPHSON, LLP BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5 755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224 MONROE, CT 06468			<table border="1"><tr><td colspan="2">EXAMINER</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">HENNING, MATTHEW T</td></tr><tr><td>ART UNIT</td><td>PAPER NUMBER</td></tr><tr><td>2131</td><td></td></tr></table>		EXAMINER		HENNING, MATTHEW T		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2131	
EXAMINER												
HENNING, MATTHEW T												
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER											
2131												
			<table border="1"><tr><td>MAIL DATE</td><td>DELIVERY MODE</td></tr><tr><td>10/11/2007</td><td>PAPER</td></tr></table>		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	10/11/2007	PAPER				
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE											
10/11/2007	PAPER											

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/099,931

Applicant(s)

BREMER, OLIVER

Examiner

Matthew T. Henning

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8,10-15,17-22 and 24-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8,10-15,17-22 and 24-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 June 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

1           This action is in response to the communication filed on 8/2/2007.

2                           **DETAILED ACTION**

3                           *Response to Arguments*

4           Applicant's arguments filed 8/2/2007 have been fully considered but they are not  
5   persuasive.

6           Regarding applicants' argument that Safadi requires personalization assistance from the  
7   network infrastructure to encrypt protected content or content encryption key, the examiner does  
8   not find the argument persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to  
9   show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant  
10   relies (i.e., encrypting . . . without assistance from the network infrastructure) are not recited in the  
11   rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations  
12   from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26  
13   USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). In this case, the claims recite that the recipient of the content  
14   consumes the content without assistance from the network infrastructure, but does not require  
15   encryption without assistance. As such, the examiner does not find the argument persuasive.

16           Regarding applicants' argument that claim 1 is not limited to the content personalization  
17   assistance being between the wireless sender and the network, or the wireless recipient and the  
18   network, the examiner does not find the argument persuasive. First, claim 1 only refers  
19   specifically to the wireless network infrastructure, and not all networks in general. The headend  
20   of Safadi is not part of the wireless network infrastructure PAN 20. Second, the claim recites  
21   very specifically that the consumption is what is unassisted (i.e. the recipient does not require  
22   assistance from the wireless network infrastructure to playback the content), and as disclosed by

Art Unit: 2131

1 Safadi, the "receiver/playback device (30) will either store the content for later use or decrypt the  
2 content for playback", and nowhere does it state that the device (30) requires assistance or  
3 receives assistance from the wireless network in order to perform playback of the content. As  
4 such, the examiner does not find the argument persuasive.

5 Regarding applicants' argument that PVR 10 of Safadi interacts with the headend, and  
6 therefore there must be assistance from the headend, the examiner does not find the argument  
7 persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features  
8 of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the wireless  
9 sender not interacting with the network infrastructure) are not recited in the rejected claim(s).

10 Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification  
11 are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir.  
12 1993). Furthermore, the headend is not part of the wireless network infrastructure PAN 20, and  
13 therefore the "assistance" is not from the network infrastructure 20. Further still, once the  
14 recipient has been approved by the headend, the content is encrypted by the PVR, using the  
15 public key of the recipient. This is the content personalization of Safadi, and there is nothing in  
16 Safadi that suggests that this encryption requires assistance or is assisted by the wireless network  
17 infrastructure. As such, the examiner does not find the argument persuasive.

18 Regarding applicants' argument that PVR 10 in communication with "a system operator"  
19 falls within the scope of content personalization assistance from the wireless network  
20 infrastructure, the examiner does not find the argument persuasive. Nowhere in Safadi is it  
21 disclosed that "a system operator" is located within the wireless network infrastructure PAN 20.  
22 As such the examiner does not find the argument persuasive.



Art Unit: 2131

1 Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-17, 19-21, 27-32, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as  
2 being anticipated by Safadi et al. (US Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0147686)  
3 hereinafter referred to as Safadi.

4 Regarding claims 1 and 28, Safadi disclosed a method comprising: forwarding peer-to-  
5 peer content in a wireless network having a network infrastructure (20), where a wireless sender  
6 (10) encrypts protected content or content encryption key and a wireless recipient (30) consumes  
7 the protected content without requiring content personalization assistance from the network  
8 infrastructure (See Safadi Paragraphs 0032, 0036-0037, 0042, and 0044).

9 Regarding claim 8, Safadi disclosed a wireless network comprising: at least two wireless  
10 terminals (10 and 30) and a network infrastructure (20) for forwarding peer-to-peer content from  
11 one wireless terminal (10) to another wireless terminal (30); the at least two wireless terminals  
12 having a peer-to-peer forwarding/reception of DRM protected content module configured for  
13 **either** encrypting **or** consuming protected content without content personalization assistance  
14 from the network infrastructure (See Safadi Paragraphs 0032, 0036-0037, and 0044).

15 Regarding claim 15, Safadi disclosed a wireless terminal comprising: one or more  
16 modules for operating in a wireless network having another wireless terminal and a network  
17 infrastructure (20) for forwarding peer-to-peer content from the wireless terminal (10) to the  
18 other wireless terminal (30), each wireless terminal having a peer-to-peer forwarding/reception  
19 of DRM protected content module configured for either encrypting, consuming, or a combination  
20 thereof, protected content without content personalization assistance from the network  
21 infrastructure (See Safadi Paragraphs 0032, 0036-0037, 0042 and 0044).

1           Regarding claim 3, Safadi disclosed that the wireless recipient sends a device certificate  
2   having a public key to the wireless sender (See Safadi Paragraphs 0036 and 0041).

3           Regarding claims 4, 11, 17, and 34, Safadi disclosed that that the wireless sender  
4   personalizes the protected content or content encryption key for the wireless recipient (See  
5   Safadi Paragraphs 0036-0037 and 0044).

6           Regarding claims 6, 13, and 20, Safadi disclosed that the wireless recipient verifies  
7   forwarded protected content received from the wireless sender by: verifying the device certificate  
8   of the wireless sender (See Safadi Paragraph 0043); and applying a private key of the wireless  
9   recipient in order for the recipient to consume the protected content (See Safadi Paragraphs  
10   0036-0037 and 0044).

11          Regarding claims 7, 14, and 21, Safadi disclosed that the protected content is digital  
12   rights management protected content (See Safadi Paragraph 0034).

13          Regarding claims 10, and 19, Safadi disclosed that the peer-to-peer forwarding/reception  
14   of DRM protected content module of a wireless sender sends a device certificate having a public  
15   key to the wireless sender (See Safadi Paragraphs 0036-0037 and 0042).

16          Regarding claim 27, Safadi disclosed that the initial message includes a device certificate  
17   to the wireless recipient (See Safadi Paragraph 0042).

18          Regarding claims 29-32, Safadi disclosed that the peer-to-peer forwarding/reception of  
19   DRM protected content protocol module of a wireless sender sends an initial message having  
20   either an international mobile equipment identity, a sender name or mobile station international  
21   Integrated subscriber digital network number to a wireless recipient (See Safadi Paragraph  
22   0036).

Art Unit: 2131

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

*A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.*

Claims 5, 12, 18, 22, 26, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Safadi as applied to claims 4, 8, and 17 respectively above, and further in view of Mott et al. (US Patent Number 6,170,060) hereinafter referred to as Mott.

Safadi disclosed that the steps for personalizing include: encrypting the content or content encryption key using a public key of the wireless recipient (See Safadi Paragraphs 0036-0037); and sending the protected content or content encryption key and a device certificate of the wireless sender to the wireless recipient (See Safadi Paragraphs 0042 and 0044), but failed to disclose signing encrypted content or content encryption key using a private key of the wireless sender, or sending the protected content with a device certificate of the sender.

Mott teaches that a digital signature should be appended to downloaded content in order to be able to verify the data (See Mott Col. 11 Paragraph 2).

It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of invention to employ the teachings of Mott in the content distribution system of Safadi by including a signature of the content with the content. This would have been obvious because the



Art Unit: 2131

1 ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to provide a means for the recipient  
2 to verify the integrity of the data. Further, it was well known in the art at the time of invention  
3 that the certificate of a signor could be included with the signed object and therefore it would  
4 have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art to have done so.

5       Regarding claim 22, the combination of Safadi and Mott disclosed a method comprising:  
6 forwarding a protected content or content encryption key from a first terminal to a second  
7 terminal, comprising the steps of: sending an initial message from the first terminal to the second  
8 terminal (See Safadi Paragraph 0042) the initial message including a sender name, an  
9 international mobile equipment identity, a mobile station integrated service digital network  
10 number, or a combination thereof (See Safadi Paragraphs 0036 and 0042); sending a digital  
11 rights management device certificate containing a public digital rights management key from the  
12 second terminal to the first terminal (See Safadi Paragraph 0041); verifying the public digital  
13 rights management key by the first terminal (See Safadi Paragraph 0041); personalizing digital  
14 rights management content or content encryption key by encryption using a public key of the  
15 second terminal (See Safadi Paragraphs 0036-0037 and 0044); signing encrypted digital rights  
16 management content or content encryption key using a private digital rights management key of  
17 the first terminal (See the rejection of claim 5 above); sending encrypted and signed digital rights  
18 management content or content encryption key together with a digital rights management device  
19 certificate of the first terminal from the first terminal to the second terminal (See the rejection of  
20 claim 5 above); verifying the digital rights management device certificate of the first terminal by  
21 the second terminal (See Safadi Paragraph 0043); and applying a private digital rights  
22 management key of the second terminal, if the private digital rights management key of the first

Art Unit: 2131

terminal is verified, in order for the second terminal to consume the protected content (See Safadi Paragraph 0044).

Regarding claim 26, see Safadi Paragraph 0042.

Regarding claim 33, see the rejection of claims 29-32 above.

Claims 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Safadi and Mott as applied to claim 23 above, and further in view of Gustafsson (US Patent Number 6,424,841).

Safadi and Mott disclosed sending encrypted and signed digital rights management content to the first terminal and verifying the same in the first terminal (See the rejection of claim 22 above), but failed to disclose sending confirmation or error messages. However, Safadi and Mott did disclose that the communications were with a cell phone (See Safadi Paragraph 0033).

Gustafsson teaches that in a mobile phone system, acknowledgment messages should be provided to the sender of a message by the recipient (See Gustafsson Col. 2 Paragraphs 3-4).

It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of invention to employ the teachings of Gustafsson in the content distribution system of Safadi and Mott by having the receiver either acknowledge proper receipt of the content or send an error message to the sender. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to ensure proper receipt of the content.

### *Conclusion*

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-15, 17-22, and 24-34 have been rejected.

Art Unit: 2131

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew T. Henning whose telephone number is (571) 272-3790. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4.

Art Unit: 2131

1           If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's  
2 supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the  
3 organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

4           Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent  
5 Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications  
6 may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished  
7 applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR  
8 system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR  
9 system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would  
10 like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated  
11 information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

12  
13  
14 /Matthew Henning/  
15 Assistant Examiner  
16 Art Unit 2131  
17 10/3/2007

  
AYAZ SHEIKH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100